

**DETROIT INTERMODAL FREIGHT TERMINAL PROJECT**  
**Local Advisory Council Meeting**  
**December 10, 2003**  
**Notes**  
*Revised February 20, 2004*

**Purpose:** To discuss the progress of the DIFT Project.

**Attendance:** See attached.

**Discussion:**

**Meeting Conduct Procedures**

Mohammed Alghurabi asked those in attendance to introduce themselves. He then indicated that the meeting conduct procedures would allow LAC members to first ask questions/make comments. Then, the observers in attendance would have their items discussed during the “public comment” section of the meeting.

**Review of Notes**

Mohammed Alghurabi asked for a review of the notes of the September, October and November meetings. Chuck Goedert indicated that on page 5 of the October meeting notes, he remembered Joe Corradino saying that an oral presentation was made to FHWA on the Fairgrounds as an alternative to the expansion of the CN/Moterm terminal but the notes refer to a document that was presented to FHWA. If a document exists, he indicated that he would like a copy.

Joe Corradino responded: a) that a position paper was developed on the Fairgrounds issue; and, b) that the request to limit the further work on expanding the CN/Moterm terminal to the Fairgrounds site was made orally to FHWA in an October meeting. However, Joe Corradino indicated he was not in a position to provide that paper to Mr. Goedert. Chuck Goedert asked what the document was called. Joe Corradino indicated that he did not remember the exact title but would provide that information following the meeting. Chuck Goedert indicated that he needed the title because he intended to make a Freedom of Information request to the appropriate parties to obtain the paper.

Kathryn Savoie referred to the November 12<sup>th</sup> draft notes discussion about the Air Quality Protocol and indicated that, while it states that volatile organic compounds would be used as a

surrogate for air toxics, she said the notes implied there was going to be a surrogate used for PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Joe Corradino indicated that no surrogate would be used for PM<sub>2.5</sub>.

Kathryn Savoie asked the source of the information that was going to be used for background air quality and would it satisfy MDEQ requirements. Joe Corradino indicated that there were a number of monitoring stations available throughout the State of Michigan, including one in southwest Detroit, and that information would be used as one point of reference of baseline conditions.

### **Old Business**

Joe Corradino indicated that a comment had been made by Chris Gulock at the last Local Advisory Council meeting concerning the lowest intermodal activity that would be realistically achieved if there were no government investment provided to the railroads. As a result, Joe Corradino had been counseling with the railroads to get an assessment of that condition. At this time, more information is still needed. When it is provided, the commodity-flow model paper will be updated.

Kathryn Savoie asked when will the DEIS be public. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated in the summer of 2004. Kathryn Savoie indicated that the schedule on the DIFT Web site needs to be updated. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that he would look into the matter.

Bill Schraeder indicated that he had some concerns about the length of time it is taking MDOT and the consultant to complete the environmental impact study. His concern stems from the fact that CP/Oak terminal is already stacking containers five high and he is convinced that a number of activities may unfold in the near term that would cause property acquisition to expand that terminal. As a result, the movements by the railroads on their own is creating concern and confusion.

Joe Corradino responded that the No Action alternative is exactly what Bill Schraeder was referring to, i.e., the railroads continuing to make investments on their own without government support and involvement to expand their intermodal operations. On the other hand, the action alternatives of Improving/Expanding existing terminals and Consolidating all the intermodal activity at the Livernois-Junction Yard would allow government to invest and be involved in

these expansion activities. Nevertheless, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is scheduled for the summer of 2004 and the process of discussing it will then unfold in subsequent months.

Kathryn Savoie indicated that releasing a document in the summer of 2004 may be inappropriate as that is vacation time for many. She inquired of the DEIS review cycle that was contemplated. Joe Corradino indicated that the federal rules require that the DEIS be made available 15 days before a public hearing to discuss it and that the comment period remain open for 30 days after the public hearing. At least that amount of time would be available to comment on the DIFT DEIS as the process is now unfolding.

Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that a request had been made at the last LAC meeting that MDOT present a display of all the projects affecting the southwest portion of Detroit. Jeff Edwards had such a map and reviewed those plans.

Kathryn Savoie indicated that she had requested a presentation be made on the analysis of key populations, such as the Arab-American community, but were not being covered in the environmental justice area. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that such a presentation would occur in the near future. Kathryn Savoie wondered how the DEIS can be completed while the methodologies are still being developed. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that work continues to proceed on various data collection and analysis processes across the range of many issues associated with completing an Environmental Impact Statement and that with months to go before the DEIS must be produced for public review in draft form, the process is moving according to schedule.

Mohammed Alghurabi referred to a transcript of a presentation that was made to the Detroit City Council on October 29<sup>th</sup> by the members of Communities for a Better Rail Alternative and Ford Motor Company. He asked if there were any comments by the CBRA representatives at the LAC. There were none.

### **Commodity-flow Model Paper**

Joe Corradino noted, as his previous discussions had indicated, that an update of the commodity-flow model paper was underway. However, he is still anticipating input from another railroad before the paper can be completed. Chuck Goedert asked which railroad(s) had responded and

which had not. Joe Corradino indicated that it was not the practice of the DIFT Project to label the specific companies by name. Nevertheless, he indicated that the discussion with the railroads had been both constructive and positive. He noted that the input received so far cited that the low end of the No Action forecast could be as low as 500,000 lifts annually in 2025. However, Joe Corradino was still awaiting information from another railroad to finalize the lowest range of the lifts based upon the lack of government investment. By the same token, Joe Corradino noted that one railroad had commented that its forecasts for 2025 for all railroads in Southeast Michigan were in the neighborhood of 950,000 to 1,000,000 lifts per year. Joe Corradino noted that the railroad's reaction to the lift forecast of 1.15 million was reasonably optimistic and consistent with the long-range approach to environmental assessment planning.

### **REMI Model**

Joe Corradino made an overall presentation of the REMI model to be applied to measure economic impacts. He noted that there would be an analysis at the regional and state levels as well as of local terminal areas. He stressed that the model was designed to do regional and statewide analyses and, when it is modified to account for a much smaller area, the results become inherently less accurate. Nevertheless, with the commitment to develop an assessment of impacts at the local level, the REMI model was being applied for the local analysis zones previously discussed with the LAC.

Kathryn Savoie asked if air quality effects were being incorporated into the economic impact analysis. Joe Corradino indicated that it was. Kathryn Savoie then questioned how this could be done when the health effects resulting from changes in air quality were not being analyzed. Joe Corradino again stressed that the Air Quality Protocol is not including a health risk assessment. Kathryn Savoie reiterated that the lack of a health risk assessment is a real concern of the community.

Father Redican asked Joe Corradino if the Federal Highway Administration does not want to conduct a health risk assessment. Joe Corradino responded that the Federal Highway Administration does not believe that the science is available to conduct such an analysis.

Kathryn Savoie indicated that she believes that this position of FHWA will eventually wind up in the courts. Joe Corradino indicated that this may be the case but that discussions with FHWA have included input from their policy/legal representatives.

Father Redican indicated that, while he understands the constraints being placed upon the process by the Federal Highway Administration, he also believes that the position taken is not “politically smart.”

Chuck Goedert asked if the REMI model allows the “ripple wave” effect of reduced per-pupil funding to be determined as a result of the acquisition process of expanding an intermodal terminal. Terry Campbell indicated that the model does take account for those effects.

Chuck Goedert asked if the analysis would be dealing with a local municipality and the DIFT effects of reducing public services, such as police, and the snowballing effect on small cities. Dr. Campbell said it does not. Joe Corradino indicated that the analysis would be done on a local terminal area but not for an entire city. Nevertheless, Joe Corradino indicated that the concept for expanding the intermodal terminal that the consultant is pursuing, i.e., to the state Fairgrounds, is totally consistent with the actual CN/Moterm terminal activity in existence through the late 1990s when CN operated both north and south of 8-Mile Road, including an area of the Fairgrounds. The number of annual lifts moved at that time was very close to that now forecast for the CN/Moterm Terminal for 2025. In that instance, through the late 1990s, the community co-existed with the terminal and there is no report that Joe Corradino knew of flight from the Ferndale area because of the terminal. Likewise, the terminal co-existed with the community in terms of its operating effects with respect to noise and truck traffic. Therefore, if past is prologue, then the past operations of CN/Moterm in the Ferndale/City of Detroit/Fairgrounds area will be very close to what can be expected of the future.

Father Redican noted that while there may be a regional positive economic effect, the local concern is about the jobs that will be lost as a result of terminal expansion. Joe Corradino indicated that, to the extent those job losses/gains can be measured, they will be.

Chuck Goedert asked what the remediation costs issue represents that is input to the REMI model. Joe Corradino indicated that when properties are bought by MDOT and turned over to a

third party through whatever mechanism, they are remediated of contamination. He stressed this was the remediation cost at the property bought by MDOT, not at the property to which a business would be relocated. In that case, the relocation would be to a property that is unaffected by contamination.

Karen Kavanaugh asked if an economic impact analysis for a project comparable to the DIFT were available to show both the forecast “before” and the actual results “after.” Joe Corradino indicated that he did not know of an after-completion analysis done of a rail-to-truck intermodal terminal as so few had been developed to a mature state to conduct such an “after” analysis. Nevertheless, Joe Corradino indicated that he was familiar with a truck-to-plane intermodal terminal and the results of that economic analysis indicated that the forecasts were exceeded multifold by actual conditions. He also noted that those results had been presented in a summary fashion to the LAC in previous meetings.

Chuck Goedert referred to page 85 in the agenda packet and made a point about the REMI approach. Joe Corradino indicated that the approach has been updated so that the baseline calculations are now being made on three alternatives, No Action, Improve/Expand Existing Terminals, as well as the Consolidation alternative. The methodology in the agenda packet, including page 85, referred to only two alternatives. That methodology was developed in 2002, before the Improve/Expand Alternative was added. It was distributed to the LAC in August 2002 and again today.

Chuck Goedert referenced page 86 of the agenda packet in asking about the version of the REMI model that was being used. Terry Campbell indicated that the most recent version that had been updated through the spring of 2003 was being used. Karen Kavanaugh indicated that at the top of page 87 of the agenda packet, it indicates that the “proposed action does not expect to involve significant population, housing, or employment related to growth impacts in either the project study area or the project region of influence.” Joe Corradino indicated that the document included in the agenda packet was a proposal offered to The Corradino Group by Dr. Campbell at the outset of the project. That information was presented to the LAC in the summer of 2002 and, for consistency’s sake, that same information is included in the current agenda packet. Nevertheless, the modeling process has been updated to include three alternatives rather than

two, the most up-to-date model available through REMI, and an understanding of the potential loss of population and jobs around each of the terminals.

Chuck Goedert referred to page 88 of the agenda packet to indicate that it states the project will measure regional and other benefits. He asked if only benefits would be measured. Dr. Campbell responded that when money is spent, benefits are assumed. Joe Corradino indicated that benefits would be measured and that benefits could be expected from an investment of between \$200 and \$400 million. Nevertheless, as indicated on the table on page 88, the positive and negative effects of the proposed intermodal terminal expansion alternatives will be measured.

Kathryn Savoie asked if the data provided through an inventory by the City of Detroit on jobs were going to be considered in the analysis. Joe Corradino indicated that those data would be reviewed. However, the city information was from such a limited sample (he remembered five responses) and extrapolated to a universe such that the use of the information was problematic, at best. Kathryn Savoie asked about the methodology and the time frame of the completion of the REMI analysis. Joe Corradino indicated that preliminary results would be available to the consultant team in January. The information would then be presented to the client in February and to the public at the March public meetings.

Kathryn Savoie again wondered how the DEIS can be completed while the methodologies are still unfolding. Joe Corradino indicated that while methodologies are being refined, considerable work is ongoing as it relates to the collection and analysis of data. For example, the REMI analysis, while being presented here today, had been submitted to the group in a basic form in August of 2002 and work has been underway for some time.

### **Town Hall Meetings**

Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that a Town Hall meeting was conducted on December 8<sup>th</sup> in Dearborn. Kathryn Savoie commented that while she had participated in the meeting, she believed that it was inappropriate to advertise that local projects would be discussed, then to specifically exclude from the discussion local projects. She agreed that discussing the Transportation Summit was productive but urged that better preparation and inclusion be part of any future planning of Town Hall meetings.

Discussion then ensued about an additional Town Hall meeting in southwest Detroit. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that he had provided information earlier to Kathryn Savoie that he believed was correct, that another town hall meeting would be conducted in January on a Friday afternoon/evening. He indicated that information may no longer be correct and that Kathryn and others would be apprised of when and where the next meetings would be held.

### **2004 Meeting Dates**

Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that the tentative list of 2004 LAC meetings was included in the agenda packet. After some discussion, it was agreed that all future meetings would be held on the second Wednesday of each month at the Dearborn Holiday Inn. All meetings of the LAC would begin at 7:00 p.m.

### **Interesting Materials**

Joe Corradino referred to a series of papers included in the agenda packet, materials that would be of interest to those involved in the DIFT.

### **Other**

Karen Kavanaugh asked if the participation in the follow-up to the Transportation Summit were open to anybody that would like to sign up. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that he did not know for sure but believed that those who wanted to join various subgroups in the continued discussion of summit results could do so.

Karen Kavanaugh asked how many people were hired as a result of the Jobs Fair held in October by CSX. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that he did not know and would ask CSX to respond.

### **Public Comment**

Marc Higginbotham indicated that the railroads had a meeting that day with County Executive Ficano to inform him of the economic contribution of the railroads to the region. He noted that the railroads employ 1,200 people who receive in compensation and fringes, \$85 million per year.



Marc Higginbotham then discussed the intentions of NS to conduct yet another job-hiring session in southwest Detroit at the facilities of *El Centrale* newspaper. He urged the LAC members to get the word out so that local people might apply for the jobs.

Marc Higginbotham concluded his remarks by indicating that the railroads bring activities that support manufacturing jobs throughout Michigan and that is consistent with the Governor's agenda.

Paul Boyce indicated that the notes of the November 13<sup>th</sup> meeting incorrectly stated his position. Based upon his comments, the notes of that meeting were to be updated.

With that, the meeting concluded at about 9:00 p.m. The next meeting was scheduled for January 14<sup>th</sup> at 7:00 p.m. at the Dearborn Holiday Inn.

*L:\Projects\2846-A\WP\notes\LocalAdvisory\LocalAdv.Dec10.doc*

**DETROIT INTERMODAL FREIGHT TERMINAL PROJECT**  
**Local Advisory Council Meeting**  
**December 10, 2003**

**Attendance**

**LAC Members**

Name	Representing	Phone
Chuck Goedert	City of Ferndale	248-398-6030
Marc Higginbotham	Norfolk Southern	
Karen Kavanaugh	SDBA/CBRA	313-842-0986
Bruce King	City of Detroit	
Fr. Joe Redican	Holy Redeemer Schools	313-841-4433
Kathryn Savoie	CBRA	
Bill Schraeder	Southfield Jeffries Bus. Assn.	313-838-8387

**LAC Observers**

Name	Representing	Phone
Mohammed Alghurabi	MDOT	517-373-7674
Paul Boyce, P.E.	Maritime Systems, Inc.	313-846-5849
Marty Comer	MARS	
Joe Corradino	The Corradino Group	313-964-1926
Michelle DeSouza	State Sen. Samuel "Buzz" Thomas	313-871-2400
Ken Dobson	Ambassador Bridge	
Jeff Edwards	MDOT	248-483-5114
Lisa Goldstein	SW Detroit Environmental Vision	
Tim Jenkins	Michigan State Fairgrounds	
Sherry Piacenti	MDOT	517-373-4152
Chris Raymond		
Harvey Santana	The Corradino Group	313-964-1926
Chuck Tucker	City of Ferndale	

*L:\Projects\2846-A\WP\notes\LocalAdvisory\LocalAdv.Dec10.doc*